

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-8, 10-21 and 23-30 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claim 21 has been canceled and claims 1-8, 10-21 and 23-25 have been amended. Claims 26-30 are added. No new matter is involved. Claims 1, 4 and 19 are independent claims.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection**

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tullis (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,243). Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,380,975). Claims 1, 16, 17-20, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,344,875 to Hashimoto. These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a combination of features that is neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the applied art. These features include (a) a first on/off switch for opening and closing a lens cap such that the first switch is on when the lens cap is open and is off when the lens cap is closed; (b) a second switch for detecting whether the camera is, or is not, connected to the PC the second switch being on when the camera is connected to the PC and the second switch is off when the camera is not connected to the PC; (c) a video conferencing mode of camera operation; (d) a digital mode of

camera operation for photographing a still image; (e) a standby mode of camera operation; (f) a still image transmission mode of camera operation; (g) a digital audio reproduction mode of camera operation; (h) a memory means for storing digital audio and video data; and (g) a controller that determines that the camera (1) is in a still image transmission mode when the first switch is off and the second switch is on; (2) is in the digital mode of camera operation for photographing a still image when the first switch is on and the second switch is off; and (3) is in the videoconferencing mode when the first and second switches are on.

None of the applied art even discloses a videoconferencing feature, let alone many of the other recited features, such as, for example, the first and second switches and controller that determines camera mode based on the setting of the switches.

Independent claim 4 positively recites a combination of features including a viewfinder for recognizing a direction and range of a photographing object and a control means for controlling the operation corresponding to the pertinent mode after judging if the PC camera is in the video conference mode, the digital camera mode, the still image transmission mode or the digital audio reproducing mode. These features are not found in any of the applied art. In fact, none of the applied art discloses using a videoconferencing mode.

Independent claim 19 recites a combination of features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Hashimoto. Claim 19 recites a combination of

features including, for example, (1) second detecting means for detecting a use state of a lens of the PC camera; and (2) wherein the mode switching means places the PC camera in a digital camera mode to use the PC camera as a handheld camera apart from the PC, if the first detecting means detects that the PC camera is electrically separated from the PC and if the second detecting means detects that the lens of the PC camera is in a use state.

While Hashimoto detects whether an electronic camera is connected to a computer and, if it is connected, permits communication between the camera and the computer – see paragraph [0008], for example.

However, Hashimoto completely fails to disclose or suggest the second detecting means for detecting the state of a lens of the camera or mode switching means that places the PC camera in a digital camera mode to use the PC camera as a handheld camera apart from the PC, if the first detecting means detects that the PC camera is electrically separated from the PC and if the second detecting means detects that the lens of the PC camera is in a use state.

Accordingly, Hashimoto does not anticipate claims 19 and 20 (which depends from claim 19).

Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 6-7, 9 and 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tullis in view of Suzuki. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tullis in view of Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 6,657,654). Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tullis in view of Suzuki and further in view of Ando (U. S. Patent No. 4,887,798). Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tullis in view of U.S. Patent 6,738,075 to Torres et al. (“Torres”). Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,344,875 to Hashimoto in view of Narayanaswami. Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Torres. These rejections, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Tullis and Suzuki, either taken singularly or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the PC camera as recited in independent claims 1 and 4 from which claims 6-7, 9 and 14 depend.

With respect to claim 11, Narayanaswami does not provide the features missing from Tullis.

With respect to clam 15, Ando actually discloses videoconferencing, but with two separate cameras 11 and 21, each of which is a dedicated high frame rate video signal generating camera, which has no viewfinder, as recited in claim 4, or a still image transmission mode or a control means that judges

which of the three recited modes each camera is in, and does not disclose a PC camera. The Office Action fails to make out a *prima facie* case of proper motivation to modify Tullis and Suzuki to do anything, let alone to invalidate or disable a picture from being sent during video teleconferencing because neither Tullis nor Suzuki disclose teleconferencing.

This rejection is wholly based on improper hindsight reconstruction of Applicant's invention based solely on Applicant's disclosure.

Moreover, even one of ordinary skill in the art were properly motivated to modify Tullis and Suzuki in view of Ando, which they would not be for reasons stated above, the resulting reference combination would not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

With respect to claim 24, Narayanaswami does not provide the features missing from Hashimoto.

With respect to claim 25, Torres does not provide the features missing from Hashimoto.

Therefore, even if the references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the PC camera as recited in independent claims 1 and 4. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 4 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) are patentable over the applied references, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

**New Claims**

Claim 26 is a dependent claim that combines the features of claims 1 and 4 and is patentable with respect to the applied art at least for the reasons stated above regarding the patentability of either claim 1 or claim 4 over the applied art. Thus, claim 26 is believed to be patentable over the applied references.

Claims 27-30 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the applied art at least for the reason that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and earnestly solicits an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert J. Webster (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit

Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther Chong  
Esther H. Chong, #40,053

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747  
(703) 205-8000

EHC/RJW:gf